



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,683	02/27/2004	Laurent Bodin	04-109	9367

7590 01/26/2005

Julian F. Santos  
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff  
32nd Floor  
300 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

KING, BRADLEY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/789,683

**Applicant(s)**

BODIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Bradley T King

**Art Unit**

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 02/27/2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the foreign application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: "a plastics material" is awkward. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 11 recite "a deformed zone". It is not clear if this is the same as the previously recited "at least one deformed zone" or an additional zone.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto (US# 6070862) in view of Sumiyoshi et al (US# 5513433).

Miyamoto discloses a vibration damping link including; a metal body 2 that is elongate in a longitudinal direction and that interconnects a first end sleeve 3 and a second end sleeve 7, both of which are part of the body, said first and second sleeves being provided with respective ones of first and second passageways that extend through the body along respective ones of first and second axes; at least one inner strength member 12 and/or 13 surrounded by a first sleeve and mounted to move inside the first passageway; at least one ring 11 surrounding the inner strength member and adapted to be inserted into and to be held in the first passageway, said ring also extending along an axis; and at least one flexible coupling 15 made of elastomer, interposed between the inner strength member and the ring. Miyamoto lacks a deformed zone cooperating with the ring (a staked connection between the sleeve and the ring). Instead, Miyamoto discloses a press fit connection. Punching or staking is well known in the art and further demonstrated by Sumiyoshi et al as a means of affixing bearing members within links. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the staked connection as known in the

art and taught by Sumiyoshi et al as an obvious alternative means of construction, thereby providing a greater degree of retention to the connection.

Regarding claim 2, Sumiyoshi et al teaches deforming both sides of the link.

Regarding claims 3-4, Sumiyoshi et al shows deforming a plurality of zones which extend continuously around the bearing member.

Regarding claim 6, Miyamoto further lacks the explicit disclosure of the ring being made of a plastic material. Material selection a well known and routine element of engineering design. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a plastic ring in the device of Miyamoto as an obvious design alternative, thereby reducing the weight of the device. Also note, *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US#'s 6612744, 6419215, 6094818 and 5857659. All show link devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley T King whose telephone number is (703) 308-8346. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00-7:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor can be reached on (703) 308-0830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3683

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BTK

*Robert A. Siconolfi* 1/24/05  
ROBERT A. SICONOLFI  
PATENT EXAMINER